#### SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

#### Document 1 Filed 11/01/11 Page 1 of 10 IL COVER SHEET Case 2:11-cv-06822-LS

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating

the civil docket sheet. (SEE II	NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)					
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS			
RACHEL TYE			NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.			
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff		County of Residence of	f First Listed Defendant	-	
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	me, Address, Telephone Number and Email Add	dress)	NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE			
Craig Thor Kimmel, E Kimmel & Silverman, 30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002				NVOLVED.		
(215) 540-8888 II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintifl	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	(F	For Diversity Cases Only) PT of This State	F DEF	and One Box for Defendant)  PTF DEF incipal Place	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	<ul><li>4 Diversity</li><li>(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)</li></ul>	Citizen	of Another State	2		
		•	or Subject of a  ign Country	3		
IV. NATURE OF SUI						
CONTRACT  ☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 151 Recovery of Overpayment	Slander 368 Asbestos Person  330 Federal Employers' Liability Liability  340 Marine Product Liability  345 Marine Product Liability 370 Other Fraud  350 Motor Vehicle 380 Other Personal  355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 385 Property Damage  385 Property Damage  385 Property Damage	RY     610   620   625   625   630   640   650   660   660   710   660   720   730   730   791   660   791   660   791   660   791   660   791   791   660   791	LABOR Fair Labor Standards Act Labor/Mgmt. Relations Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act Railway Labor Act	BANKRUPTCY  □ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158  □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157  ■ PROPERTY RIGHTS  □ 820 Copyrights □ 840 Trademark  ■ SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) ■ FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	OTHER STATUTES  400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 770 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
<b>№</b> 1 Original □ 2 Re	an "X" in One Box Only) emoved from	☐ 4 Reinst Reope	ened anothe	erred from	Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Brief description of cause: Fair Debt Collection Practices A		- 3			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	VII. REQUESTED IN		,			
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE	//		DOCKET NUMBER		
Explanation:		h				
DATE	SIGNATURE O	OF ATTORN	NEY OF RECORD	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

### Case 2:11-cv-068**22Nt/DepDepLyments trived 10/01/1/1** Page 2 of 10

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.						
Address of Plaintiff: 301 West Michigan Avenue, Grass Lake MI 49240						
Address of Defendant: 507 Prudential Read, Harsham, A 19044						
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:  (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space)						
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and						
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes No					
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes No P					
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:						
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:					
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:						
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?						
Yes No 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?						
action in this count.	Yes No					
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously						
terminated action in this court?	Yes No No					
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights of	case filed by the same individual?					
	Yes No No					
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)						
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:					
1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts					
2. □ FELA	2. □ Airplane Personal Injury					
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. ☐ Assault, Defamation					
4. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury					
5. □ Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury					
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please					
	specify)					
7. □ Civil Rights	7. □ Products Liability					
8. □ Habeas Corpus	8. □ Products Liability — Asbestos					
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases					
10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify)						
10. Social Security Review Cases  11 Dell All other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S. C 3 1692  (Rease specify)						
ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION  (Check Appropriate Category)  , counsel of record do hereby certify:						
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of						
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;						
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	E 71/1X					
DATE: 1081-11 [100] /107 /MM 3/100						
Atforney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#					
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there	nas deen compnance with r.R.C.P. 38.					
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or wi	thin one year previously terminated action in this court					
except as noted above.						
DATE: 10-31-11 (rung / Nert imple) 57100						
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#					

CIV. 609 (6/08)

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

	CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM	
+	Rachel Type : CIVIL ACTION	
N	CO Francial Systems, Inc.	
	In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counse plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the tir filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reside of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.	ne of verse said ve on
	SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:	
	(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.	( )
	(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.	( )
	(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	
	(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.	( )
	(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)	( )
	(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.	( )
	Date  Attorney-at-law  Attorney for  Attorney for  Attorney for  Attorney for  Attorney for  Attorney for	w.com

**FAX Number** 

E-Mail Address

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Telephone

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 FOR THE 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 3 RACHAEL TYE, 4 Plaintiff 5 Case No .: v. 6 7 NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR **JURY TRIAL** 8 Defendant (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 9 10 **COMPLAINT** 11 RACHAEL TYE ("Plaintiff"), by and through her attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, 12 P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"): 13 INTRODUCTION 14 Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 1. 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA"). 16 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE** 17 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states 18 that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court 19 20 without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original 21 jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States. 22 3. Defendant has its corporate headquarters in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 23 and as such, personal jurisdiction is established. 24 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1). 25

#### **PARTIES**

- 5. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Grass Lake, Michigan.
- 6. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(3).
- 7. Also, Plaintiff is a person granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a) and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2000).
- 8. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, PA 19044.
- 9. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

#### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 11. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties.

  See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.
- 12. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not

engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any
person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt
collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection
with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use
unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f.
The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there
exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which
harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in
connection with the collection of a debt.

- 13. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 14. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

#### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 16. At all pertinent times hereto, Defendant was hired to collect a consumer debt and attempted to collect that debt from Plaintiff.
- 17. Upon information and belief, the debt arose out of transactions that were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 18. Beginning in or before October 2010, and continuing through August 2011, Defendant continuously and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 19. Plaintiff received telephone calls from Defendant from the following telephone number: 800-785-1426, which the undersigned has confirmed is a telephone number that belongs to Defendant.
- 20. Defendant contacted Plaintiff, on average, at least ten (10) times a week, causing Plaintiff to receive more than twenty (20) collection calls a month.
- 21. On those days when Defendant contacted Plaintiff, sometimes Plaintiff would receive two (2) collection calls from Defendant.
- 22. Wanting the phone calls to stop, Plaintiff informed Defendant to stop calling her on her home telephone.
- 23. Plaintiff informed Defendant it was inconvenient for her to receive Defendant's collection calls at her home, since many of its telephone calls were received at dinner time or after Plaintiff had put her children to bed.
- 24. Despite Plaintiff's unambiguous instructions to Defendant stop calling her home, Defendant continued to call Plaintiff on a continuous and repetitive basis.
- 25. Thereafter, Defendant called Plaintiff, on average, at least two (2) times per day, sometimes calling as frequently as four (4) times a day.

- 26. Also, Defendant would contact Plaintiff several days in a row, for the sole purpose of harassing her.
- 27. For example, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on August 22, 2011, at 9:27 a.m.; August 23, 2011, at 10:34 a.m.; and August 24, 2011, at 9:20 a.m.
- 28. Further, in addition to calling Plaintiff on her home telephone, Defendant also left messages on her home answering machine instructing her to call Kelly Hales and providing an I.D. Code 55135727.
- 29. Upon information and belief, Defendant called Plaintiff on a repetitive basis with the intent to harass Plaintiff into paying an alleged debt.
- 30. The repetitive calls to Plaintiff were intended by Defendant to be disturbing, harassing, and an invasion of privacy, so that Plaintiff would pay the alleged debt.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

- 31. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." Russell v. Equifax A.R.S., 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp., 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); Clomon v. Jackson, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 32. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be

construed liberally in favor of the consumer." <u>Johnson v. Riddle</u>, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).

33. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

# COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 34. In its actions to collect a debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
  - a. Defendant violated the FDCPA generally;
  - b. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(1) of the FDCPA when it communicated with Plaintiff at a time or place that it knew or should have known was inconvenient;
  - c. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA when it harassed, oppressed or abused Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt;

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

- d. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA when caused Plaintiff's phone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to annoy, abuse, or harass Plaintiff; and
- e. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA when it used unfair and unconscionable means in connection with the collection of a debt.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, RACHAEL TYE, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutor y damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

#### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, RACHAEL TYE, demands a jury trial in this

case.

Date: 10-31-11

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By:

Craig Thor Kimmel Attorney ID No. 57100

Tara L. Patterson

Attorney ID No. 88343

Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike

Ambler, PA 19002

Phone: (215) 540-8888

Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email:

 $\underline{kimmel@creditlaw.com}$ 

Email:

tpatterson@creditlaw.com